UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,670	01/05/2006	Thomas Gore	I-2002.025 US	4798
31846 INTERVET IN	7590 02/19/200 C.	EXAMINER		
PATENT DEPA	ARTMENT	HURT, SHARON L		
PO BOX 318 MILLSBORO, DE 19966-0318			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/539,670	GORE ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		SHARON HURT	1648				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Donsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. To period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or re roply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 D	ecember 2007					
•	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 December 2007</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
٥,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
· · _	Claim(s) <u>28-42</u> is/are pending in the applicatio	n					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	_						
•	5)∭ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>28-42</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement					
		r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
•	The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	∋ 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate				

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

Claims 28-42 are pending and under examination. Claims 1-27 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The rejection of claims 28, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appel et al. (4,193,990) and Appel et al. (4,193, 991) in view of Pratelli et al. (Journal of Veterinary Diagnostic Investigation, 1999, Vol. 11, pages 365-367) **is maintained**.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 19, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue "MVC is a totally different virus than CPV-2." Applicants argue "There is a clear genetic difference between MVC/CPV-1 and CPV-2." Applicants also argue that "prior to Applicant's invention, no MVC vaccines were available. Hence, it is unreasonable to expect that MVC can be made into a vaccine simply because vaccines exist for CPV-2." Applicants further argue "The fact that canines have been naturally afflicted by MVC and have antibodies to this virus does not anticipate or render obvious Applicants' vaccine."

Claims 28, 30 and 32 are drawn to a vaccine comprising MVC, a.k.a. CPV-1, wherein the MCV is inactivated or attenuated live. The differences between CPV-1 and CPV-2 are well documented in the art. Appel et al. teaches a vaccine against CPV comprising modified live or

inactivated MVC, a.k.a. CPV-1. Therefore, Appel teaches a MVC vaccine a.k.a. CPV vaccine. Pratelli et al. teaches antibodies to CPV-1 are found in dogs with CPV-1 infection. The combination of references teaches the limitations of the instant invention. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a vaccine against CPV-1 for dogs. The person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the vaccine because Appel teaches a vaccine comprising CPV, and reasonably would have expected success because the vaccine taught by Appel protected the dogs upon challenge with CPV.

The rejection of claims 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appel et al. (4,193,990) and Appel et al. (4,193,991) in view of Pratelli et al. as applied to claims 28, 30 and 32 above, and further in view of Audonnet et al. (US Patent No. 6,159,477, Dec. 2000) is maintained.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue "none of the references teach or suggest the claimed MVC vaccine". Applicants also argue "CPV-2 has been widely studied to the point where numerous vaccines are on the market." Applicants further argue "prior to Applicants' invention, no MVC vaccines were available."

These arguments have been addressed supra.

The rejection of claims 28-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appel et al. (4,193,990) and Appel et al. (4,193,991) in view of Pratelli et al. and Audonnet et al. as applied to claims 28-33 above, and further in view of Poulet et al. (Veterinary Record,

Art Unit: 1648

2001, Vol. 148, No. 22, pages 691-695) and Correa (Alabama Cooperative Extension System, November 2002, 7 pages) is maintained.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments are the same remarks as listed above and they are not persuasive.

Applicants arguments have been addressed supra. The references do teach a MVC vaccine a.k.a.

CPV vaccine.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHARON HURT whose telephone number is (571)272-3334. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30 PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/539,670 Page 5

Art Unit: 1648

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sharon Hurt

February 12, 2008

/Bruce Campell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1648